

RCRA Programs Branch Highlights

October 8, 1999

Watervliet Arsenal/Watervliet, NY - RPB attended a meeting at the NYSDEC office in Albany, NY to discuss the Watervliet Arsenal facility with representatives from NYSDEC, NYSDOH, the Department of the Army, the US Army Corps of Engineers and the Arsenal's contractors on 10/6/99. The meeting was held to discuss the Draft RFI for the Main Manufacturing Area (MMA), Exposure Assessment for the MMA of the Site, the Preliminary Screening of Technologies for the CMS Report and the up-coming Installation Action Plan (IAP) Partnering Workshop. Among the issues discussed were:

- , Whether field work for the RFI effort was considered complete,
- , Proposed format for the Exposure Assessment,
- , The development and use of Site-Specific Clean-up Levels (SSTLs),
- , Technical issues related to the Exposure Assessment,
- , The screening of technologies for the CMS,
- , Proposed IAP Partnering Workshop logistics,
- , Site-wide schedules.

Erie County Recycling of Construction and Demolition Debris Project

- In FY'99 we awarded a \$36,250 RCRA Section 8001 Solid Waste Management Demonstration Grant to the Erie County Department of Environmental and Planning (ECDEP) to stimulate the recycling of construction and demolition (C&D) debris. The September 27, 1999, edition of Waste News reports that the Village of Blasdell, New York has decided to participate in the project in by recycling its old sidewalks. Blasdell is replacing 18,000 linear feet of sidewalks this year. Instead of sending the broken concrete to landfill, with the grantee's guidance, the Village sent the concrete to CTS Crushing and Recycling Company, to be re-used as aggregate for roadbeds and other uses. There were no disposal costs to Blasdell. Blasdell's Mayor commented that participating in the recycling program will save taxpayer money by avoiding landfill disposal fees. Other Erie County communities are now becoming aware of the cost savings of sending their concrete debris for recycling, thereby avoiding disposal costs.

As part of the grant, ECDEP will publish a report on the total amount of C&D debris recycled, as well as the jobs created at recycling companies in the area. Another project being fostered through the grant is the use building products made from recycled C&D debris in the rehabilitation of housing by Habitat for Humanity. ECDEP's C&D recycling efforts have also been reported in the Buffalo News.

New York City Defends its Commercial Recycling Rate - The New York City Department of Sanitation (NYCDOS) has come under criticism in recent week from environmental and community groups claiming the recycling rate for

commercial waste at waste transfer stations (WTS) has fallen to 4.2%. This is well below the 25% required by City law. However, the October 4, 1999, edition of Waste News reports that NYCDOS has mounted a defense claiming that most commercial recycling is done before the material is shipped to WTSs. NYCDOS states that with the inclusion of fill material and C&D waste, the commercial recycling rate was 57.8 % for the first three months of 1999. Barbara Warren, of the Organization of Waterfront Neighborhoods, countered by saying the NYCDOS has allowed a WTS permit modification to remove recycling equipment. Warren said, "we're losing more of our recycling infrastructure."

DuPont Chambers Works/Deepwater, NJ - On October 4, 1999, RPB staff participated in a meeting with HQ OSW, Region 3 RCRA, and DuPont representatives, held at EPA, Region 3, Philadelphia. The purpose of the meeting was to initiate a dialogue around how decisions on groundwater discharge to surface water environmental impacts can be evaluated in the context of the CA750 (Groundwater Migration Under Control), RCRA Environmental Indicator (EI).

DuPont presented their tiered-approach proposal. The essence of the proposal is to evaluate the effects of constituents of concern (COC) to significantly impact surface water, sediment, or eco-system and to consider contaminant flux, dilution in surface water, relevant physiochemical parameters, available sediment and surface water data, potential ecological effects, and other potential contamination sources.

The issue of whether a "mixing zone" should be allowed when determining allowable groundwater to surface water limits for the Delaware River Basin was also discussed. Other than further clarifying some of the elements in the CA750 definition, no new or additional approaches were suggested. EPA and DuPont agreed to continue the discussion.

On October 7, 1999, RPB had a conference call with NJDEP management and staff. The purpose of the conference call was to discuss NJDEP's position for an upcoming meeting with DuPont on October 13, 1999 concerning the groundwater discharge to the Delaware River in the context of the CA750 evaluation.

It was noted that the Total Mass Daily Loading (TMDL) and Watershed projects currently ongoing under the NJDEP Surface Water Program would address the GW-SW issue however, no decisions are expected in time to facilitate making our CA750 decisions by the 2005 targeted year. However, it was noted that we could make CA750 decisions, based on the information currently available, since there is no indication that at current discharge levels, there is any immediate threat to the Delaware River. These decisions could be conditioned on subsequent review by the Surface Water Program, when the TMDL and Watershed projects are complete.

Therefore, we could propose, based on the current status of the NJDEP TMDL and Watershed projects as described by NJDEP, that we make conditional CA750 decisions. RPB would like to initiate discussions with WPB to gain insights into how we could address the groundwater to surface water discharge issue as it pertains to

CA 750.

From: ANDY PARK
To: TORNICK-BARRY
Date: 10/8/99 10:53am
Subject: DuPont Highlight -Reply

DUPONT CHAMBERS WORKS/DEEPWATER, NEW JERSEY:

Meeting at Region 3 Office in Philadelphia: On October 4, 1999, the RPB staff participated in a meeting with HQ OSW, Region 3 RCRA, and DuPont representatives, held at the Region 3 EPA office in Philadelphia. The purpose of the meeting was to initiate a dialogue around how decisions on groundwater discharge to surface water environmental impacts can be evaluated in the context of CA750 (Groundwater Migration Under Control), RCRA Environmental Indicator (EI).

DuPont presented their tiered-approach proposal. The essence of the proposal is to evaluate constituents of concern (COC) ability to significantly impact surface water, sediment, or eco-system and to consider contaminant flux, dilution in surface water, relevant physiochemical parameters, available sediment and surface water data, potential ecological effects, and other potential contamination sources.

EPA suggested that a question of whether a mixing zone should be allowed for the Delaware River Basin be discussed. Other than further clarifying some of the elements in the CA750 definition, no new or additional approaches were suggested. EPA and DuPont agreed to continue the discussion.

Conference Call with NJDEP: On October 7, 1999, the RPB staff had a conference call with the BCM (Mr. Frank Faranca, Project Manager) and BGWPA (Mr. David Sweeney, Bureau Chief, and Anne Pavelka, Geologist) of NJDEP. The purpose of the conference call was to feel and assess NJDEP's position for an upcoming meeting with DuPont on October 13, 1999 concerning the groundwater discharge to Delaware River in the context of CA750 evaluation.

It was noted that the Total Mass Daily Loading (TMDL) and Watershed projects currently ongoing under the NJDEP Surface Water Program would address the GW-SW issue however, their timeline of completion may well delay RCRA CA750 decisions beyond the RCRA targeted year, 2005. Also noted was a possibility that any RCRA CA750 decisions will be revisited by the Surface Water Program later at the time when the TMDL and Watershed projects are complete. Under the situations, discussed was an other possible option: making CA750 decisions on an interim basis or with conditions or caveats so that they can be revisited at a later time if new standards or environmental conditions make previous EPA CA750 decisions no longer be appropriate or applicable.

Suggestion: It is reasonable that, under the current status of the NJDEP TMDL and Watershed projects as described by NJDEP, we make conditional CA750 decisions. Documentation would be necessary to show the current status of the NJDEP projects. We (RPB) could initiate it by sending a memorandum to the Region 2 Water Program.

>>> BARRY TORNICK 10/08/99 07:47am >>>

Please do a DuPont highlight on the meeting last week and what we plan to do at the one next week.

From: BARRY TORNICK
To: APark
Date: 10/8/99 7:47am
Subject: DuPont Highlight

Please do a DuPont highlight on the meeting last week and what we plan to do at the one next week.

From: ANDY PARK
To: TORNICK-BARRY
Date: 10/5/99 3:27pm
Subject: Message from Frank Faranca -Reply -Reply

I haven't got a chance to talk to him yet. It is a message already taped in when I came in the office this morning. If he calls me back in response to my message today, I will indicate to him to that effect.

>>> BARRY TORNICK 10/05/99 03:24pm >>>
Did you tell him that we didn't resolve much?

>>> ANDY PARK 10/05/99 02:45pm >>>
He left a message on my voice mail. He said that he would have attended the GW-SW meeting in Philadelphia if he had known it earlier. He would want to have the technical team attend.

10/5/99 ROC w/Frank Faranca
I informed him that not much
~~of~~ accomplishment has been made.
AP.

From: ANDY PARK
To: btornick
Date: 10/5/99 2:45pm
Subject: Message from Frank Faranca

He left a message on my voice mail. He said that he would have attended the GW-SW meeting in Philadelphia if he had known it earlier. He would want to have the technical team attend.

In response to my message on 9/30/99.

